arXiv:1101.5415v2 [math.RA] 15 Apr 2011

On Skew Polynomials over p.q.-Baer and p.p.-Modules

Mohamed Louzari

Department of mathematics
Abdelmalek Essaadi University
B.P. 2121 Tetouan, Morocco
mlouzari@yahoo.com

This work is dedicated to my Professor El Amin Kaidi Lhachmi from University of Almería on the occasion of his 62nd birthday.

Abstract

Let M_R be a module and σ an endomorphism of R. Let $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, we say that M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$ (respectively, $\mathcal{C}_2$), if $ma = 0$ implies $m\sigma(a) = 0$ (respectively, $m\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $ma = 0$). We show that if M_R is p.q.-Baer then so is $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ whenever M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_2$, and the converse holds when M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$. Also, if M_R satisfies $\mathcal{C}_2$ and σ-skew Armendariz, then M_R is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x,x^{-1};\sigma]_{R[x,x^{-1};\sigma]}$ ($\sigma \in Aut(R)$) is a p.p.-module. Many generalizations are obtained and more results are found when M_R is a semicommutative module.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 16S36, 16D80, 16W80

Keywords: Semicommutative modules, p.q.-Baer modules, p.p.-modules.

1 Introduction

In this paper, R denotes an associative ring with unity and modules are unitary. We write M_R to mean that M is a right module. Throughout, σ is an endomorphism of R (unless specified otherwise), that is, $\sigma\colon R \to R$ is a ring homomorphism with $\sigma(1) = 1$. The set of all endomorphisms (respectively, automorphisms) of R is denoted by $End(R)$ (respectively, Aut(R)). In [10],

---

Published in Inter. Math. Forum, Vol. 6, 2011, no. 35, 1739 - 1747

Kaplansky introduced Baer rings as rings in which the right (left) annihilator of every nonempty subset is generated by an idempotent. According to Clark [9], a ring R is said to be *quasi-Baer* if the right annihilator of each right ideal of R is generated (as a right ideal) by an idempotent. These definitions are left-right symmetric. Recently, Birkenmeier et al. [7] called a ring R a *right* (respectively, *left*) *principally quasi-Baer* (or simply *right* (respectively, *left*) *p.q.-Baer*) if the right (respectively, left) annihilator of a principally right (respectively, left) ideal of R is generated by an idempotent. R is called a *p.q.-Baer* ring if it is both right and left p.q.-Baer. A ring R is a right (respectively, left) *p.p.-ring* if the right (respectively, left) annihilator of an element of R is generated by an idempotent. R is called a *p.p.-ring* if it is both right and left p.p.-ring.

Lee-Zhou [12] introduced Baer, quasi-Baer and p.p.-modules as follows:
(1) M_R is called *Baer* if, for any subset X of M, $r_R(X) = eR$ where $e^2 = e \in R$.
(2) M_R is called *quasi-Baer* if, for any submodule N of M, $r_R(N) = eR$ where $e^2 = e \in R$.
(3) M_R is called *p.p.* if, for any $m \in M$, $r_R(m) = eR$ where $e^2 = e \in R$.

In [3], a module M_R is called *principally quasi Baer* (p.q.-Baer for short) if, for any $m \in M$, $r_R(mR) = eR$ where $e^2 = e \in R$. It is clear that R is a right p.q.-Baer ring if and only if R_R is a p.q.-Baer module. If R is a p.q.-Baer ring, then for any right ideal I of R, I_R is a p.q.-Baer module. Every submodule of a p.q.-Baer module is p.q.-Baer module. Moreover, every quasi-Baer module is p.q.-Baer, and every Baer module is quasi-Baer module.

A ring R is called *semicommutative* if for every $a \in R$, $r_R(a)$ is an ideal of R (equivalently, for any $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0$ implies $aRb = 0$). In [8], a module M_R is semicommutative, if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mRa = 0$. Let σ an endomorphism of R, M_R is called σ-semicommutative module [13] if, for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mR\sigma(a) = 0$. According to Annin [1], a module M_R is *σ-compatible*, if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ if and only if $m\sigma(a) = 0$.

In [12], Lee-Zhou introduced the following notations. For a module M_R, we consider

$$M[x;\sigma] := \left\{\sum_{i=0}^{s} m_i x^i : s \geq 0, m_i \in M\right\},$$
$$M[[x;\sigma]] := \left\{\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} m_i x^i : m_i \in M\right\},$$
$$M[x,x^{-1};\sigma] := \left\{\sum_{i=-s}^{t} m_i x^i : \ t \geq 0, s \geq 0, m_i \in M\right\},$$
$$M[[x,x^{-1};\sigma]] := \left\{\sum_{i=-s}^{\infty} m_i x^i : s \geq 0, m_i \in M\right\}.$$

Each of these is an Abelian group under an obvious addition operation. Moreover $M[x;\sigma]$ becomes a module over $R[x;\sigma]$ under the following scalar product operation:

For $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{n} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma]$ and $f(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma]$

$$m(x)f(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n+m}\left(\sum_{k=i+j} m_i\sigma^i(a_j)\right)x^k \qquad (*)$$

Similarly, $M[[x;\sigma]]$ is a module over $R[[x;\sigma]]$. The modules $M[x;\sigma]$ and $M[[x;\sigma]]$ are called the *skew polynomial extension* and the *skew power series extension of* M, respectively. If $\sigma \in Aut(R)$, then with a scalar product similar to $(*)$, $M[x,x^{-1};\sigma]$ (respectively, $M[[x,x^{-1};\sigma]]$) becomes a module over $R[x,x^{-1};\sigma]$ (respectively, $R[[x,x^{-1};\sigma]]$). The modules $M[x,x^{-1};\sigma]$ and $M[[x,x^{-1};\sigma]]$ are called the *skew Laurent polynomial extension* and the *skew Laurent power series extension* of M, respectively. In [13], a module M_R is called *σ-skew Armendariz,* if $m(x)f(x)=0$ where $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{n} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma]$ and $f(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma]$ implies $m_i\sigma^i(a_j)=0$ for all i and j. According to Lee-Zhou [12], M_R is called *σ-Armendariz,* if it is σ-compatible and σ-skew Armendariz.

In this paper, we show that if M_R is p.q.-Baer then so is $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ whenever M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_2$, and the converse holds when M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$ (Proposition 2.3). Also, if M_R satisfies $\mathcal{C}_2$ and σ-skew Armendariz, then M_R is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x,x^{-1};\sigma]_{R[x,x^{-1};\sigma]}$ ($\sigma \in Aut(R)$) is a p.p.-module (Proposition 3.1). As a consequence, if M_R is semicommutative and σ-compatible then:
M_R is a p.p.-module $\Leftrightarrow$ M_R is a p.q.-Baer module $\Leftrightarrow$ $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module $\Leftrightarrow$ $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.q.-Baer module (Theorem 3.6). Moreover, we obtain a generalization of some results in [3, 4, 6, 12].

2 Skew polynomials over p.q.-Baer modules

We start with the next definition.

Definition 2.1. *Let $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. We say that M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$ (respectively, $\mathcal{C}_2$), if $ma=0$ implies $m\sigma(a)=0$ (respectively, $m\sigma(a)=0$ implies $ma=0$).*

Note that M_R is σ-compatible if and only if it satisfies $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$. Let M_R be a module and $\sigma \in End(R)$.

Lemma 2.2. *If M_R satisfies $\mathcal{C}_1$ or $\mathcal{C}_2$, then $me=m\sigma(e)$ for any $m \in M$ and any $e^2=e\in R$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{C}_2$, from $m\sigma(e)(1-\sigma(e))=0$, we have $0=m\sigma(e)(1-e)=m\sigma(e)-m\sigma(e)e$, so $m\sigma(e)e=m\sigma(e)$. From $m(1-\sigma(e))\sigma(e)=0$, we have $0=m(1-\sigma(e))e=me-m\sigma(e)e$, so $m\sigma(e)=m\sigma(e)e=me$. The same for $\mathcal{C}_1$. $\square$

Proposition 2.3. *Let M_R be a module and $\sigma \in End(R)$.*
(1) If M_R is a p.q.-Baer module then so is $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$, whenever M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_2$.
(2) If $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ or $M[[x;\sigma]]_{R[[x;\sigma]]}$ is a p.q.-Baer module then so is M_R, whenever M_R satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$.

Proof. (1) Let $m(x) = m_0 + m_1x + \cdots + m_nx^n \in M[x;\sigma]$. Then $r_R(m_iR) = e_iR$, for some idempotents $e_i \in R$ $(0 \le i \le n)$. Let $e = e_0e_1 \cdots e_n$, then $eR = \cap_{i=0}^{n} r_R(m_iR)$. We show that $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x)R[x;\sigma]) = eR[x;\sigma]$. Let $\phi(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_px^p \in r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x)R[x;\sigma])$. Since $m(x)R\phi(x) = 0$, we have $m(x)b\phi(x) = 0$ for all $b \in R$. Then

$$m(x)b\phi(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n+p} \left(\sum_{\ell=i+j} m_i\sigma^i(ba_j) \right) x^\ell = 0.$$

- $\ell = 0$ implies $m_0ba_0 = 0$ then $a_0 \in r_R(m_0R) = e_0R$.
- $\ell = 1$ implies
$$m_0ba_1 + m_1\sigma(ba_0) = 0 \tag{1}$$
Let $s \in R$ and take $b = se_0$, so $m_0se_0a_1 + m_1\sigma(se_0a_0) = 0$, since $m_0se_0 = 0$ we have $m_1\sigma(se_0a_0) = m_1\sigma(sa_0) = 0$, so $m_1sa_0 = 0$, thus $a_0 \in r_R(m_1R) = e_1R$. In equation (1), $m_1\sigma(ba_0) = m_1\sigma(be_1a_0) = m_1\sigma(b)e_1\sigma(a_0) = 0$, by Lemma 2.2. Then equation (1) gives $m_0ba_1 = 0$, so $a_1 \in e_0R$.
- $\ell = 2$ implies
$$m_0ba_2 + m_1\sigma(ba_1) + m_2\sigma^2(ba_0) = 0 \tag{2}$$
Let $s \in R$ and take $b = se_0e_1$, so $m_0se_0e_1a_2 + m_1\sigma(s)e_0e_1\sigma(a_1) + m_2\sigma^2(se_0e_1a_0) = 0$, but $m_0se_0e_1a_2 = m_1\sigma(s)e_0e_1\sigma(a_1) = 0$ we have $m_2\sigma^2(se_0e_1a_0) = 0$, since $e_0e_1a_0 = a_0$ we have $m_2\sigma^2(sa_0) = 0$ and so $m_2sa_0 = 0$ for all $s \in R$. Hence $a_0 \in e_2R$ (thus, $a_0 \in e_0e_1e_2R$). Equation (2), becomes $m_0ba_2 + m_1\sigma(ba_1) + m_2\sigma^2(b)e_0e_1e_2\sigma^2(a_0) = 0$, which gives
$$m_0ba_2 + m_1\sigma(ba_1) = 0 \tag{2'}$$
Take $b = se_0$ in equation $(2')$, we have $m_0se_0a_2 + m_1\sigma(se_0a_1) = 0$, but $m_0se_0a_2 = 0$ so $m_1\sigma(se_0a_1) = m_1\sigma(sa_1) = 0$ and thus $m_1sa_1 = 0$, hence $a_1 \in e_1R$ (so, $a_1 \in e_0e_1R$). Equation $(2')$ gives $m_0ba_2 = 0$, so $a_2 \in e_0R$.

At this point, we have $a_0 \in e_0e_1e_2R$, $a_1 \in e_1e_2R$ and $a_2 \in e_0R$. Continuing this procedure yields $a_i \in eR$ $(0 \le i \le n)$. Hence $\phi(x) \in eR[x;\sigma]$. Consequently, $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x)R[x;\sigma]) \subseteq eR[x;\sigma]$. Conversely, let $\varphi(x) = b_0 + b_1x +$

$b_2x^2 + \cdots + b_px^p \in R[x;\sigma]$. Then

$$m(x)\varphi(x)e = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n+p}\left(\sum_{\ell=i+j} m_i\sigma^i(b_j)\sigma^\ell(e)\right)x^\ell = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n+p}\left(\sum_{\ell=i+j} m_i\sigma^i(b_j)e\right)x^\ell.$$

Since $e \in \bigcap_{i=0}^n r_R(m_iR)$, then $m_iRe = 0$ $(0 \le i \le n)$. Thus $m(x)\varphi(x)e = 0$, hence $eR[x;\sigma] \subseteq r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x)R[x;\sigma])$. Thus $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x)R[x;\sigma]) = eR[x;\sigma]$, therefore $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is p.q.-Baer.

(2) Let $0 \ne m \in M$. We have $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(mR[x;\sigma]) = eR[x;\sigma]$ for some idempotent $e = \sum_{i=0}^n e_ix^i \in R[x;\sigma]$. We have $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(mR[x;\sigma]) \cap R = e_0R$. On other hand, we show that $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(mR[x;\sigma]) \cap R = r_R(mR)$. Let $a \in r_R(mR)$ then $mRa = 0$, so $mR\sigma^i(a) = 0$ for all $i \ge 1$. So $mR[x;\sigma]a = 0$. Therefore $a \in r_{R[x;\sigma]}(mR[x;\sigma]) \cap R$. Conversely, let $a \in r_{R[x;\sigma]}(mR[x;\sigma]) \cap R$, then $mR[x;\sigma]a = 0$, in particular $mRa = 0$, so $a \in r_R(mR)$. Thus $a \in r_R(mR) = e_0R$, with $e_0^2 = e_0 \in R$. So M_R is p.q.-Baer. The same method for $M[[x;\sigma]]$. □

Corollary 2.4 ([3, Theorem 11]). *M_R is p.q.-Baer if and only if $M[x]_{R[x]}$ is p.q.-Baer.*

Corollary 2.5 ([6, Theorem 3.1]). *R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if $R[x]$ is right p.q.-Baer.*

M_R is called *σ-reduced module* by Lee-Zhou [12], if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$:
(1) $ma = 0$ implies $mR \cap Ma = 0$,
(2) $ma = 0$ if and only if $m\sigma(a) = 0$.

Corollary 2.6 ([3, Theorem 7(1)]). *Let M_R a σ-compatible module. Then the following hold:*
(1) If $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.q.-Baer module then so is M_R. The converse holds if in addition M_R is σ-reduced.
(2) If $M[[x;\sigma]]_{R[[x;\sigma]]}$ is a p.q.-Baer module then so is M_R.

Corollary 2.7 ([4, Corollary 2.6]). *Let M_R be a σ-compatible module. Then M_R is p.q.-Baer if and only if $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is p.q.-Baer.*

3 Skew polynomials over p.p.-modules

Let M_R be an σ-Armendariz module, if $me = 0$ where $e^2 = e \in R$ and $m \in M$, then $mfe = 0$ for any $f^2 = f \in R$ (by [12, Lemma 2.10]). This result still true if we replace the condition "M_R is σ-Armendariz" by "M_R is σ-skew Armendariz satisfying $\mathcal{C}_2$".

Proposition 3.1. *Let M_R be a σ-skew Armendariz module which satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_2$. The following statements hold:*
(1) M_R is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module,
(2) Let $\sigma \in Aut(R)$, then M_R is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x,x^{-1};\sigma]_{R[x,x^{-1};\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module.

Proof. (1)($\Leftarrow$) Is clear by [12, Theorem 2.11].
($\Rightarrow$) Let $m(x) = m_0 + m_1x + \cdots + m_nx^n \in M[x;\sigma]$, then $r_R(m_i) = e_iR$, for some idempotents $e_i \in R$ $(0 \leq i \leq n)$. Let $e = e_0e_1 \cdots e_n$, then $m_ie = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ ([12, Lemma 2.10]) and by Lemma 2.2, we have $m_i\sigma^j(e) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $j \geq 0$. Therefore $e \in r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x))$, so $eR[x;\sigma] \subseteq r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x))$. Conversely, let $\phi(x) = a_0+a_1x+\cdots+a_px^p \in r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x))$, then $m(x)\phi(x) = 0$. Since M_R is σ-skew Armendariz, we have $m_i\sigma^i(a_j) = 0$ for all i,j and with the condition $\mathcal{C}_2$ we have $m_ia_j = 0$ for all i,j. So $a_j \in r_R(m_i) = e_iR$ for all i,j. Thus $a_j \in \cap_{i=0}^n r_R(m_i) = eR$ for each j. Then $\phi(x) \in eR[x;\sigma]$, therefore $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(m(x)) = eR[x;\sigma]$. With the same method, we can prove (2). □

Corollary 3.2 ([12, Theorem 11(1a,2a)]). *If M_R is σ-Armendariz. Then:*
(1) M_R is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module,
(2) Let $\sigma \in Aut(R)$, then M_R is a p.p.-module if and only if $M[x,x^{-1};\sigma]_{R[x,x^{-1};\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module.

If M_R is a semicommutative module such that, $m\sigma(a)a = 0$ implies $m\sigma(a) = 0$ for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. Then M_R is σ-semicommutative and hence it satisfies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$. To see this, suppose that $ma = 0$ then $mRa = 0$, in particular $mr\sigma(a)a = 0$ for all $r \in R$. By the above condition, $mr\sigma(a) = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Thus M_R is σ-semicommutative.

Lemma 3.3. *If M_R is a semicommutative module such that $m\sigma(a)a = 0$ implies $m\sigma(a) = 0$ for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. Then M_R is σ-skew Armendariz.*

Proof. Let $m(x) = m_0 + m_1x + \cdots + m_nx^n \in M[x;\sigma]$ and $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_px^p \in R[x;\sigma]$. From $m(x)f(x) = 0$, we have $\sum_{i+j=k} m_i\sigma^i(a_j) = 0$, for $0 \leq k \leq n+p$. So, $m_0a_0 = 0$. Assume that $s \geq 0$ and $m_i\sigma^i(a_j) = 0$ for all i,j with $i+j \leq s$. Note that for $s+1$, we have

$$m_0a_{s+1} + m_1\sigma(a_s) + \cdots + m_s\sigma^s(a_1) + a_{s+1}\sigma^{s+1}(a_0) = 0 \tag{1}$$

Multiplying (1) by $\sigma^s(a_0)$ from the right hand, we obtain

$$m_0a_{s+1}\sigma^s(a_0)+m_1\sigma(a_s)\sigma^s(a_0)+\cdots+m_s\sigma^s(a_1)\sigma^s(a_0)+a_{s+1}\sigma^{s+1}(a_0)\sigma^s(a_0) = 0,$$

we have $m_0a_0 = 0$, then $m_0\sigma^s(a_0) = 0$ because M_R is σ-semicommutative, and so $m_0a_{s+1}\sigma^s(a_0) = 0$. Also, $m_1\sigma(a_0) = 0$ then $m_1\sigma^s(a_0) = 0$, thus

$m_1\sigma(a_s)\sigma^s(a_0) = 0$. Continuing this process until the step s, $m_s\sigma^s(a_0) = 0$ then $m_s\sigma^s(a_1)\ \sigma^s(a_0) = 0$. Therefore $m_{s+1}\sigma^{s+1}(a_0)\sigma^s(a_0) = 0$. But

$$m_{s+1}\sigma^{s+1}(a_0)\sigma^s(a_0) = m_{s+1}\sigma[\sigma^s(a_0)]\sigma^s(a_0) = 0.$$

So $m_{s+1}\sigma^{s+1}(a_0) = 0$. Therefore, equation (1), becomes

$$m_0a_{s+1} + m_1\sigma(a_s) + \cdots + m_s\sigma^s(a_1) = 0 \tag{2}$$

Multiplying (2), by $\sigma^{s-1}(a_1)$ from the right hand to obtain $m_s\sigma^s(a_1) = 0$. Continuing this procedure yields

$$m_0a_{s+1} = m_1\sigma(a_s) = \cdots = m_s\sigma^s(a_1) = a_{s+1}\sigma^{s+1}(a_0) = 0.$$

A simple induction shows that $m_i\sigma^i(a_j) = 0$, for all i, j. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let M_R be a module such that $m\sigma(a)a = 0$ implies $m\sigma(a) = 0$ for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. If M_R is semicommutative then $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ and $M[[x;\sigma]]_{R[[x;\sigma]]}$ are semicommutative.*

Proof. Let $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} m_ix^i \in M[x;\sigma]$, $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_jx^j \in R[x;\sigma]$ and $\phi(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{p} b_kx^k \in R[x;\sigma]$. Suppose that $m(x)f(x) = 0$. The coefficients of $m(x)\phi(x)f(x)$ are of the form

$$\sum_{u+v=w} m_u\sigma^u\left(\sum_{i+j=v} b_i\sigma^i(a_j)\right) = \sum_{u+v=w}\left(\sum_{i+j=v} m_u\sigma^u(b_i)\sigma^{u+i}(a_j)\right).$$

By Lemma 3.3, $m_u\sigma^u(a_j) = 0$, for all u, j and by $\mathcal{C}_1$, $m_u\sigma^{u+i}(a_j) = 0$, for all i, j, u. Since M_R is semicommutative then $m_u\sigma^u(b_i)\sigma^{u+i}(a_j) = 0$, therefore

$$\sum_{u+v=w} m_u\sigma^u\left(\sum_{i+j=v} b_i\sigma^i(a_j)\right) = 0.$$

So $m(x)\phi(x)f(x) = 0$, then $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is semicommutative. The same for $M[[x;\sigma]]_{R[[x;\sigma]]}$. □

According to Baser and Harmanci [3], a module M_R is *reduced* if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma^2 = 0$ implies $mR \cap Ma = 0$. By [2, Lemma 2.11], if M_R is semicommutative p.p. or semicommutative p.q.-Baer then it's reduced.

Corollary 3.5. *Let M_R be a semicommutative module satisfying the condition $\mathcal{C}_1$, if M_R is p.q.-Baer or p.p. then $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ and $M[[x;\sigma]]_{R[[x;\sigma]]}$ are semicommutative.*

Proof. Let $a \in R$ and $m \in M$ such that $m\sigma(a)a = 0$, then $m(\sigma(a))^2 = 0$ (by $\mathcal{C}_1$), since M_R is reduced we have $m\sigma(a) = 0$. By Proposition 3.4, $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ and $M[[x;\sigma]]_{R[[x;\sigma]]}$ are semicommutative. □

Theorem 3.6. *If M_R is semicommutative and σ-compatible. Then the following are equivalent:*
(1) *M_R is p.p.*
(2) *M_R is p.q.-Baer,*
(3) *$M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is p.p.,*
(4) *$M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is p.q.-Baer,*

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) By [2, Proposition 2.7]. (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) By Proposition 2.3.
(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) Since M_R is a p.p.-module, then Corollary 3.5 implies that $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is semicommutative. Therefore $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is p.q.-Baer by [2, Proposition 2.7]. (4) $\Rightarrow$ (3) By Proposition 2.3, M_R is p.q.-Baer, since M_R is semicommutative then $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is semicommutative, and so $M[x;\sigma]_{R[x;\sigma]}$ is a p.p.-module. □

Corollary 3.7. *Let M_R be a semicommutative module. Then the following are equivalent:*
(1) *M_R is p.p.*
(2) *M_R is p.q.-Baer,*
(3) *$M[x]_{R[x]}$ is p.p.,*
(4) *$M[x]_{R[x]}$ is p.q.-Baer,*

Corollary 3.8 ([5, Theorem 2.8])**.** *If M_R is a reduced module. Then the following are equivalent:*
(1) *M_R is p.p.*
(2) *M_R is p.q.-Baer,*
(3) *$M[x]_{R[x]}$ is p.p.,*
(4) *$M[x]_{R[x]}$ is p.q.-Baer,*

Proof. Every reduced module is semicommutative by [12, Lemma 1.2]. □

References

[1] S. Annin, *Associated primes over skew polynomials rings*, Comm. Algebra, **30** (2002), 2511-2528

[2] M. Baser and N. Agayev, *On reduced and semicommutative modules*, Turk. J. Math., **30** (2006), 285-291.

[3] M. Baser and A. Harmanci, *reduced and p.q.-Baer modules*, Taiwanese J. Math., **2** (1) (2007), 267-275.

[4] M. Baser and A. Harmanci, *On quasi-Baer and p.q.-Baer modules*, Kyungpook Math. Journal, **49** (2009), 255-263.

[5] M. Baser and M.T. Kosan, *On quasi-Armendariz modules*, Taiwanese J. Math., **12** (3) (2008), 573-582.

[6] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.Y. Kim and J.K. Park, *On polynomial extensions of principally quasi-Baer rings*, Kyungpook Math. journal, **40** (2) (2000), 247-253.

[7] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.Y. Kim and J.K. Park, *Principally quasi-Baer rings*, Comm. Algebra, **29** (2) (2001), 639-660.

[8] A.M. Buhphang and M.B. Rege, *semicommutative modules and Armendariz modules*, Arab J. Math. Sciences, **8** (2002), 53-65.

[9] W.E. Clark, *Twisted matrix units semigroup algebras*, Duke Math. Soc., **35** (1967), 417-424.

[10] I. Kaplansky, *Rings of operators*, Math. Lecture Notes series, Benjamin, New York, 1965.

[11] T.K. Kwak, *Extensions of extended symmetric rings*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc., **44** (2007), 777-788.

[12] T. K. Lee and Y. Lee, *Reduced Modules*, Rings, modules, algebras and abelian groups, 365-377, Lecture Notes in Pure and App. Math., **236**, Dekker, New york, (2004).

[13] C.P Zhang and J.L. Chen, *σ-skew Armendariz modules and σ-semicommutative modules*, Taiwanese J. Math., **12** (2) (2008), 473-486.